

short of war." Yet some people thought President Roosevelt invented that phrase. I go so far as to say that our embargo under the provisions of our Neutrality Act is an act "short of war," if it is supposed to restrain belligerents, and not in any sense a warlike act.

I now come to another part of my radio address, and then I am through:

Study, too, will show that America is more united in opinion today than she was in 1914, but President Wilson's neutrality proclamation received the same wholehearted support from all our citizens in August 1914, as President Roosevelt's did today. Even ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, who later so strongly took sides and urged in the strongest terms that America should enter the war on the side of England and France, wrote during the first weeks of the war, "Of course it would be folly to jump into the gulf ourselves, and to no good purpose, and very probably nothing that we could have done would have helped Belgium. We have not the smallest responsibility for what has befallen her." (Outlook—September 23, 1914.)

Let us review the first days of the 1914 World War and our neutrality then. We will find much that is the same; still we will see a great difference. Then we assumed a European war was, after all, not of our concern. Today we may assert that but we know it is hardly true. The real truth in each case is and was that war anywhere is of universal concern. Peace, too, must be of universal concern. Regardless of what anyone may think or hope, the world is a unit in more ways than in its purely physical one.

Today no one expects anyone to be neutral in mind and thought. One Nation-wide poll on who is responsible for the present war shows that 82 percent of our people hold one side responsible. That does not give great promise for impartiality.

WHAT WILSON URGED

In 1914, President Wilson, 2 weeks after issuing his neutrality proclamation, said: "The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are trying men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle above another. My thought is of America—a Nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own councils, and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world."

Wilson's first statement and his proclamation were based upon the theory of neutrality as announced by Washington and Jefferson.

But proclamations and speeches do not alter facts. They are powerless when it comes to changing men's opinions. The people of our country were not "impartial in thought." Still they remained "neutral in fact" as far as actions were concerned for nearly 3 years. They stood on their rights and they condemned the wrongdoer. And while standing as a neutral their condemnation of a wrong did not take them into war. Had it done so we would have fought on both sides.

American neutrality has not been an unchanging thing from Washington's first neutrality proclamation to the present. It has grown and developed or it has become weak and supine, according to the emphasis. Sometimes neutral rights have been stressed, at other times neutral duties. There is an ocean of distance both in theory and fact between Jefferson's notion, that it was not the function of the Government to interfere with the economic affairs of the people and that as many people made their living in manufacturing arms their sale should not be prohibited, and the 1937 Neutrality Act. From the beginning to the present the American tendency has been to interpret neutrality to mean impartiality and to withdraw all moral judgment and base our stand of neutrality upon a simple rule of law instead of upon moral actions. It is nevertheless here where our neutrality has failed and we have turned to war. Therefore let's give up—

Here is where I suggest the giving up—

Therefore, let's give up the "impartial" dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged, and place our neutrality upon the fundamental rights of a nation to carry on its peaceful pursuits even during war without being a party to the war. Whatever our neutrality has meant during the last 140 years, the right to stay at peace has been stronger than our dream of being impartial in thought, word, speech, and action.

Let us stand upon this platform—war between two or more nations cannot diminish the rights of any nation or nations that want to remain at peace. Maintain that stand upon a moral basis. Then American neutrality will stand and become the force in the world it should be.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we would be like Him, who, with a consciousness deeper than the sea and higher than the stars, said calmly insistently: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." Wilt Thou show us the path of life: "In Thy presence is fullness of joy; at Thy right hand are pleasures forever more." Let us begin this day with a fine impulse sweeping through our breasts, possessing a vision that conquers fears and immortalizes hopes. O Thou who art the purest of the mighty and the mightiest of the pure, who dost guide the worlds through space, cannot be less wise and kind than the shepherd who leads his flock into green pastures. In a world in which we hear so much of the roar of things and whose future no one can foretell, O may we have a place in the hollow of Thy hand where our souls may find whiteness and our minds unity. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 13, 1939, was read and approved.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 calendar days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RANKIN. Including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. I would like to know what the idea of the gentleman is in making the request, because they all get permission to do it anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. My understanding is that we will probably adjourn over. We have been doing that. The RECORD will be printed every day, at any rate.

Mr. RICH. It would be a good thing if we did adjourn over, because if we had a roll call there would not be enough here to do business anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not object to adjourning over, but if we do, I would like the Members to have that permission.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would this include remarks made before other bureaus and boards?

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Mississippi was that all Members may have the right for 3 calendar days to extend their own remarks in the RECORD. It would not include excerpts or extraneous matter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and insert a speech made by the Honorable Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROTARY CLUB, BEDFORD, IND.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent days of wars, of mass murder, it is good to know that we live in the United States of America, a peace-loving Nation. It is good to know that we have institutions in our country which work for peace and better world understanding. I am a charter member of a club which has a local in my home town of Bedford, Ind. I have been a member continuously since its founding. The work of this club, locally, by districts, by

State, by Nation, and throughout the world works for peace, for harmony, for moral uplift, and works for better world acquaintanceship and world understanding. I refer to the Rotary Club. It has branches almost all over the world.

I recently had occasion to take up my attendance in far-away Oslo, Norway, while there at the recent Interparliamentary Union Conference. I found at Oslo the same fine personnel that I find in these clubs everywhere I go.

The reason I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time is on account of a very splendid letter I have just received from my local club. I shall set it out and it is as follows:

BEDFORD ROTARY CLUB,
BEDFORD, IND., October 12, 1939.

Hon. E. B. CROWE, M. C.,
House Office Building, Room 1234, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In recognition of your outstanding service to our community and the State of Indiana, the board of directors of Bedford Rotary Club has authorized me to confer upon you an honorary membership in the Bedford Rotary Club.

The honorary membership includes the privilege of attending all meetings, relieves the honoree of the necessity of the payment of dues, and waives the usual attendance requirements.

The board of directors wishes to take this means of expressing its appreciation of your past service and is happy to have you as an honorary member of the Bedford Rotary Club.

Rotarily yours,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Bedford Rotary Club.
By JOHN D. WALLS,
Secretary.

I consider this one of the finest honors that I have ever had bestowed upon me for the reason it does not come from some far-away group who only see me at my best but this recognition is from a group of good fellows with whom I have lived.

I have lived with many of them in this group for 25 or more years. I have lived with numerous ones of them before there was a Rotary Club in my town and accordingly have been with and around a number of them for 40 years. I, therefore, appreciate this nice honor more than words can express and my wish goes out to them and to all clubs of Rotary that it may continue its good work and ever be a continuous and lasting vehicle for good throughout the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter which I received from the Rotary Club of Bedford, Ind., my home town.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short address I made at the American Association of State Highway Officials in Richmond, Va., on October 10, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] be granted leave of absence for 1 week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. McGEHEE] may have permission to extend his own remarks and include a short excerpt from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Wednesday after business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. Wolcott] may have 20 minutes in which to address the House on next Wednesday, after any other special orders which may have been entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Boake Carter, appearing in the Evening Public Ledger of Philadelphia, September 29, 1939, entitled "The Second Surrender."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a brief sermon entitled "The Christian Churches' Message to America," by Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 29 of this year I was in London. Rather late that evening in company with a colleague from Indiana, we started out to see some things of interest in that city. We had proceeded only a short distance when I saw something that reminded me of a similar incident some 22 years ago. We were attracted by two powerful beams of light directed into the sky. It was a moonlight night. Just a few lazy, fleecy clouds were floating over the sky, and these two beams of light had pinned an object which appeared to be about the size of my hand. It was a plane; it was a British plane. They evidently were trying out these beams of light. Along the streets were sandbags around the basements of buildings, and in windows, and there were trenches, pill boxes, and dugouts in the parks.

Twenty-two years ago in December I saw a hostile plane pinned between beams of light and heard the antiaircraft guns and the terrific explosions and the rapid-fire guns. The next morning I went out in company with British officials to see what damage had been done. Among other things, on the street where we were looking a laundry had been completely destroyed. Some 25 bombs were dropped that night in a section of the city where the working people lived. and I remember that scene. I took particular pains to measure one of the craters where a house had stood. The crater was 30 feet across and 12 feet deep. I saw women there, and children, some bandaged, shivering in the cold. They were homeless because a series of these houses had been destroyed by these bombs. That was war. That was the result of an air raid 22 years ago.

Later, crossing over into France and up near the Wichet sector, I visited 19 craters caused by explosives. They were of an average size of about 200 feet across and 40 feet deep. It took the British men 9 months to tunnel in under a hill occupied by the enemy there to deposit high explosives and ultimately to blast them into the infernal regions. Two hundred feet across and 40 feet deep. And the officers told me that in tunneling through to get under that hill during that 9 months' work there were places where they tunneled through 40 feet of putrid human flesh. That ground had been fought over, and fought over, and fought over. That was war in 1917.

I went to one of the base hospitals on the British front, a hospital which had a capacity of 3,000 men a day, where in 1 month 4,500 soldiers had gone in and out. They lived in terror of air raids every minute. That was in 1917, 22 years ago.

I remember riding toward the city of Perrone. I was not accustomed to seeing human ribs sticking out of the flat

ground swept clear of every living thing. It was pointed out to me that there had been a town there, but that day one was not able to see even a brick; everything was ground to powder. That was done with the instrumentalities of war in use 22 years ago.

During the last 22 years people have learned something about war, and they realize that scientists and officers have been engaged during all that time with all the resources available in chemical plants and laboratories to create new implements of human destruction. It is hard to conceive just what this next war is going to be. It might be interesting to you men to know that in the defense of Verdun alone—there are soldiers on the floor here who, of course, know all this; but it is just as well, perhaps, that the country should know it—the French sent 3,800,000 men to the defense of Verdun. They fired 18,000,000 shells during February and July 1916; and I saw the 7 miles that had been swept clean of every living tree and shrub. I saw shoes with the feet still in them. I would have you remember that since the close of the World War to 1930 there had been gathered from that battlefield alone, every day, seven cartloads of human bones to be deposited in a great monument erected there in memory of the men who died at Verdun. That was war then.

The question is: What was accomplished by that war or by our participation in it? I shall discuss this a little later, but I wanted to give you just a little picture of war back in those dark days, almost a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing the vast majority of the people of this country are agreed upon; they do not want war. A small, a very small, but a very powerful minority may desire war profits, although they profess to be for peace. I do not believe, in fact I cannot bring myself to believe, that businessmen generally want war for profits or otherwise. I fully realize that a great many people who abhor war and desire peace wish to see the Hitler regime defeated, and I am one of those who share this emotion; but here we must stop and think lest these unneutral thoughts, translated into unwise action, lead us into another foreign war. We cannot participate in the war without being a party to it.

The real issue involved is: What course should be pursued to keep this Nation from being drawn or led into the European war?

There is at present upon the statute books a neutrality law which went into effect August 31, 1935, and which was continued in force by the joint resolution of May 1, 1937. This country was at peace then and it is at peace right now with every nation in the world.

The existing neutrality statute was therefore introduced, debated, passed by both branches of Congress, and signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt at a time of national peace. Thus this legislation was enacted, not in the heat of passion, prejudice, or partisanship, but in a spirit of calm deliberation and with an unanimity seldom displayed in both branches of Congress. The Neutrality Act was passed in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 6 and by a vote of 376 to 13 in the House of Representatives. Now in an hour of crisis, in an hour of passion, the Congress is asked to repudiate, to repeal this expressed will of a sovereign people, and return to international law, which brought about our entrance into the World War in 1917.

Is there anyone bold enough to dispute the fact that this Nation was operating under international law prior to and during the old World War? We can start with the premise that it was so operating as an established fact. That the United States sought to defend this same so-called international law with its men on land and sea and in the air and also loaned its money to the extent of over \$13,000,000,000 to foreign countries, which sum is not being repaid by any of the debtors except Finland, is also a factual matter of record. The United States has, in addition, paid for its championship of international law more than \$63,500,000,000. I ask, Are we going to be unneutral in order to engage in contraband commerce because of the supposed profits that may accrue to our country? I call attention to the fact that the gross value of all our exports from the

United States to Great Britain and France for the record-breaking year 1916 was only \$2,115,537,090, which was but one-ninth of the appropriations of the first session of the World War Congress. Are we to disregard the cost in human life, in suffering to the insane, the blind, the crippled, the tubercular, and the gassed victims of that war, all a part of the ghastly result of endeavoring to police the world in the name of international law? This is, in part, the answer to those who seek to repeal the present Neutrality Act, which we enacted as a safeguard against a repetition of our former mistake, and which is performing the function for which it was enacted.

Now, the propaganda artillery has been brought into action to deter honest citizens who express their views in support of the arms embargo to their duly elected representatives in Washington, much as the propaganda machinery is used to suppress individual opinions and free speech abroad. The few who are on the stage shouting "peace under the cash-and-carry plan" know that behind the scenes the instruments of war are being made and sharpened for wholesale throat cutting and blood letting abroad under the sanctity of international law.

Those who really desire to keep this Nation out of war must strip the issue of all hypocrisy now masquerading under the banner of cash and carry. Let us examine the record and see how much reliance can be placed on peace talk by those who insist upon the repeal of the present Neutrality Act as a means of insuring peace. This is not the first time that "peace" has been the slogan under circumstances not dissimilar to the present. I call attention to some peace oratory, most persuasive and sufficiently convincing to achieve not its avowed purpose but to attain quite another objective. I invite attention to the speech of ex-Governor Glynn, of New York, as temporary chairman and keynote speaker at the Democratic Convention at St. Louis in 1916. I assume there are a few men in the Congress who were then present and heard this stirring address:

The United States is constrained—

Said Governor Glynn—

by the traditions of its past, by the logic of its present, and by the promise of its future, to hold itself apart from the conflict that now devastates the nations across the seas.

I am sure that those who heard him then were thrilled as he warmed to his subject and entered the realm of politics in his stirring flights of oratory on the subject of peace:

Fighting for every degree of injury—

Said the Governor—

would mean perpetual war, and this is the policy of our opponents, deny how they will. It would not allow the United States to keep the sword in the scabbard as long as there remains an unrighted wrong or an unsatisfied hope between the snowy wastes of Siberia or the jungled hills of Borneo. It would give us a war abroad each time the fighting cock of the European weather vane shifted with the breeze. It would make America the cockpit of the world. It would mean the reversal of our traditional policy of government. It would mean the adoption of imperialistic doctrines which we have denounced for over a century. * * * In a word, the policy of our opponents would make the United States the policeman of the world. Rome tried to be policeman of the world and went down; Portugal tried to be policeman of the world and went down; Spain tried and went down; and the United States proposes to profit by the experience of the ages and avoid ambitions whose reward is sorrow and whose crown is death.

I remind my colleagues that the Government at that time failed to "profit by the experience of the ages," but now that we have paid the price by not heeding the experience of the ages, it will be well for us and for the people to profit by our experience of 23 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for those who desire peace to be lulled into a sense of false security by dramatic phrases while the citadel of neutrality is torn down by those who seek fool's gold under a cash-and-carry plan. What is it in the Neutrality Act of 1935 that is objectionable? In substance, the main points of the act are these:

First. An embargo upon the export of arms, munitions, and implements of warfare to all belligerents.

Second. A system of registration of munitions manufacturers and of licensing munitions exports under the supervision of a National Munitions Board.

Third. Delegation of power to the President to (a) withhold protection from any American citizen traveling on any vessel of any belligerent nation if he considers it advisable; (b) prohibit the entrance of any foreign submarine during war into American ports or territorial waters except under conditions prescribed by the President; (c) require bond of vessels suspected of leaving American port for the purpose of delivering up to any belligerent warship or supply ship men or fuel, munitions, or other supplies.

If this act were not working and doing precisely what it was intended to do, there would be no proposal here at the present time to destroy it. I am not surprised that so many people are perplexed by the present proposal of President Roosevelt, in view of what he said on August 14, 1936, at Chautauqua, N. Y., a great educational center located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. On this occasion President Roosevelt warned his audience that:

Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.

President Roosevelt went on to say:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work.

What could lead to greater bewilderment and confusion on the part of the public than to find President Roosevelt now leading the forces seeking repeal of the Neutrality Act and holding out the inducement in his message to Congress on September 21, 1939. To quote from that message, it was this:

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we would give employment to thousands doing it here?

I do admit that this is a very tempting morsel of hope to hold out to 10,000,000 unemployed. It is an almost irresistible psychological appeal to personal self-interest. The same thread of psychological inducement ran through many of the peace talks delivered throughout the country in 1916.

I quote from some of the speeches made by President Woodrow Wilson at that time:

I pledge you that, God helping me, I will keep you out of war. (Milwaukee speech.)

There is a moral obligation laid upon us to keep free the courses of our commerce and our finance, and I believe that America stands ready to vindicate those rights (Topeka speech).

One commander of a submarine might set the world on fire. There are cargoes of cotton on the seas; there are cargoes of wheat on the seas; there are cargoes of manufactured articles on the seas, and one of those cargoes may be the point of ignition (St. Louis speech).

There is one thing Kansas ought to be interested in, and that is that we must maintain our rights to sell our products to any neutral country anywhere in the world. We should be allowed to send the wheat that grows on the Kansas fields and the cotton in our Southern States to neutrals who need them, without interference from any of the warring nations (Topeka speech).

I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the professions of peace recently uttered by the leaders of the countries now at war in Europe. I wish to cite a few examples on this point:

Mr. Baldwin: The fight (for peace and the League of Nations) is worth it, and it is a fight that this country has been engaged in for some years and is engaged in now, and will continue in for centuries if need be (The Times, March 25, 1935).

Mr. Laval: Our country does not fear war, as I have said at Geneva, but it hates it (The Times, April 14, 1936).

Mr. Blum: The Front Populaire Government . . . will make every effort to establish real security in the world, a security based on "disarmed peace" (Manchester Guardian, May 8, 1936).

Herr Hitler: The National Socialists . . . have a gigantic program at home. That obliges us to seek peace and friendship with the rest of the world (The Times, June 19, 1934).

Signor Mussolini expressed his views in Rome, October 27, 1930: "Let it be clear, however, that we are arming ourselves spiritually and materially in order to defend ourselves, not in order to attack. Fascist Italy will never take the initiative of war" (George Seldes, *Sawdust Caesar* 1936, p. 385).

Subsequent events make a hollow mockery out of all these reiterated professions as to a real desire for peace.

We cannot depend on these so-called peace assurances. The general responsibility for the situation so far as the United States is concerned rests with this Congress, and it is by our acts, not by our speeches alone, that the issue of war or peace will be determined.

There was a time when as a student, studying the subject, I thought international law was something very sacred and the last refuge of protection for a neutral nation. It is well to remember, however, that this Government was endeavoring to operate under international law prior to the last war. Yes; more than that, the Government entered the war to defend the principle of international law. In support of this, I quote the unyielding position taken by President Wilson, as stated by him to Senator Stone on February 24, 1916:

Once accept a single abatement of right—

Said President Wilson—

and many other humiliations would certainly follow and the whole fine fabric of international law would crumble under our hands, piece by piece.

I assert that one of the major contributing factors to the participation of the United States in the World War was an attempt on our part to champion international law, and we even went so far as to attempt to maintain the rights of other neutrals under it. The Nation is now asked to follow the same course which, 22 years ago, cost the lives of 126,000 of our men, thousands of crippled and blind and, as I have stated and which I repeat for sake of emphasis, the sum of \$63,500,000,000, including a debt for money loaned to foreign nations amounting to more than \$13,000,000,000.

I ask: Did the World War bring anything more than a temporary inflationary rise to the price of farm products? What has been the condition of the farmers since the World War? The farmers know the answer. Is it necessary to describe the condition of industry and of the working men and women when a few years later the final backwash of the war struck our shores?

President Roosevelt told my friends at Chautauqua on August 14, 1936, when he addressed himself to "War profits as a lure," that—

Nevertheless—and I speak from long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear—

Said the President—

that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens.

I would remind my colleagues that the President was addressing himself to the Neutrality Act which it is now sought to repeal. Continuing, the President said:

Industrial and agriculture production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.

It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

Then the President reminded the Chautauqua audience that—

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry, and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor is destroyed.

I am sure that this indictment of war profits gained from the sale of goods to belligerent nations should be a deterrent to the adoption of the present proposal of President Roosevelt, which would again inflict such penalties upon the people of this country.

Cash and carry is a delusion and a snare, the purpose of which is not neutrality, but war profits and nothing else except to favor one group of nations against another. The extension of credit, in other words, loans, is the entering wedge to war. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Book of 1914 contained the views expressed by Secretary of State Bryan on this very question. I quote from Secretary Bryan's explanation, as follows:

It is inconsistent with the spirit of neutrality for a neutral nation to make loans to belligerent nations, for money is the worst of contrabands; it commands all other things. A very forcible illustration has been used in support of this proposition, namely, that as a neutral government does all in its power to discourage its citizens from enlisting in the armies of other countries, it should discourage those who, by loaning money, would do more harm than they could do by enlisting. The Government withdraws the protection of citizenship from those who enlist under other flags—why should it give protection to money when it enters into foreign military service? There is only one answer.

The policy recommended by Secretary Bryan was not followed. Subsequent events, however, demonstrated its practical wisdom.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman stated a moment ago that this cash-and-carry plan would favor one side against the other. Of course, he meant it would favor France and England. I am wondering, and I ask the gentleman if it is not true, that if this cash-and-carry plan is applied to all, with the Atlantic Ocean teeming with submarines and airplanes, and the Pacific Ocean open, would it not be easier to transport these munitions across the Pacific Ocean through Russia into Germany probably than it would to transport them across the Atlantic Ocean to England and France.

Mr. REED of New York. I will answer the gentleman in this way. I do not claim to be an expert on war transportation. This is one of the most highly involved technical subjects. The way the gentleman states it, it would be a possibility were it not for the fact that under the arms embargo such shipments could not be made to either Germany or Russia because each one of them is in debt to the United States. They would come under the provision of the Johnson Act. The Treasury reports show that both Germany and Russia are debtors to the United States.

I ask, will not the cash-and-carry, or credit-and-carry plan, even though the contraband is carried in foreign ships, bring the war to our shore? One writer, Walter Lippmann, contends that the repeal of the arms embargo makes it much more certain that the war will remain 3,000 miles from our shores.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Was it not the idea of this cash-and-carry plan that all commodities that were destined for belligerent nations should be carried on foreign ships?

Mr. REED of New York. That would make the situation no different. When they struck the 3-mile line, they would have the naval forces of belligerent countries camped along there, as they are hovering on one coast now, in the expectation that this embargo clause will be repealed.

Mr. RICH. They would not have to sink any American ships?

Mr. REED of New York. What would happen? Let me finish this and I will answer the gentleman's question right here.

I maintain that if we should establish ourselves as an arsenal for warring nations, such a program is an invitation to every hostile battleship and submarine to hover along our shore just beyond the 3-mile limit and wait until its cash-and-carry prey leaves one of our harbors and crosses the line, and when the stern of the ship crosses the international 3-mile line, then and there the bombardment will begin. There will be disputes as to whether hostilities were begun within or without the international limits. To protect our own neutral waters and our own shores, our Navy and air

force will be called upon to take a hand, and plain common sense ought to convince anyone that such a course of policing will eventually lead to international controversies and to war.

The range of these guns firing on the 3-mile line will endanger every harbor where there are cash-and-carry ships.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Are not the submarines hovering around our shores now looking for ships carrying munitions of war?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; they are hovering there, and they have had an invitation to hover there.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Would they do it any more on account of repealing this embargo clause?

Mr. REED of New York. When we become a great arsenal, of course they will.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made reference to the 3-mile limit. In making that reference, has he taken into consideration the fact that certain officials of this country have declared a 300-mile limit as new international law?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; taking in 13 British possessions.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This country has not declared that. Our multimillionaire Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, not an authority on international law or national law, has declared the "Sumner Welles" 300-mile limit.

Mr. REED of New York. But that was the outcome of the conference held at Panama.

If we should repeal the arms embargo and convert our industries into arsenals for the prosecution of the European war, can we not foresee the placing of heavy guards at our railroad bridges, around munitions plants, and war industries in an attempt to prevent the inevitable sabotage and explosions incident to the manufacture and transportation of arms and munitions in time of war? Thus, we bring upon ourselves many of the tragedies of war instead of keeping the curse of war 3,000 miles from our shore.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert a list of the explosions, the loss of life, and the millions of dollars of property that was destroyed as a result of operations in this country before we declared war in 1917. This occurred because we were supplying munitions of war under international law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

LIST OF MAJOR EXPLOSIONS AND FIRES IN AMERICAN MUNITIONS PLANTS AND FACTORIES SUPPLYING MUNITIONS OF WAR DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1914 TO 1917

(Source: The German Secret Service in America, 1914-18, by John Price Jones and Paul Merrick Hollister. Publishers: Small, Maynard & Co.)

1914

August 30. Explosion in the powder mill of the Du Pont Powder Co., at Pompton Lakes, N. J.

September. Explosion in the guncotton section of the Wright Chemical Works. Three deaths and large property damage.

October. Explosion in the factory of the Pain Fireworks Display Co. Several deaths and destruction of the plant. Explosion in the fireworks factory of Detwiller & Street in Jersey City. Four deaths and much property damage.

1915

January 1. Fire in Buckthorne plant of the John A. Roebling Co., makers of shells, at Trenton, N. J. The \$1,500,000 plant was completely destroyed.

January-June. Du Pont Factories at Haskell, N. J., Carneys Point, N. J., Wayne, Pa., and Wilmington, Del. experienced fires and explosions. A chemical explosion occurred in a factory in East Nineteenth Street, New York. Explosion in the Anderson Chemical Co., Wallington, N. J., guncotton plant. Three lives lost. Explosion in the Equitable powder plant at Alton, Ill. Five deaths.

May 30. Explosion on a barge laden with dynamite in the harbor of Seattle, Wash. Widespread damage.

June 26. Explosion in the Aetna powder plant at Pittsburgh. One man killed and 10 others injured.

July. Explosion of a tank of phenol at a plant in New York City. Explosion at the benzol plant of the Semet Solvay Co. at Solvay, N. Y. Factory destroyed. Incendiary fires at the Midvale Steel Co. plant; at the shell plant of the Brill Car Co.; in the Southwark Machinery Co.; and in the shell department of the Diamond Forge and Steel Co.

July 7. Explosion in the Du Pont powder factory at Pompton Lakes, N. J. Explosion in the benzol plant of Harrison Bros., Philadelphia; \$500,000 damage.

July 16. Explosion and fire at the Aetna powder plant at Sinemahoning, Pa. Five deaths.

July 19. Explosion at the Wilmington plant of the Du Pont Co. July 25. Munitions train on the Pennsylvania line blown up at Metuchen, N. J.

July 28. Explosion again hits the Du Pont works at Wilmington.

July 29. Explosion of glaze mill in the American Powder Co. at Acton, Mass. Mill destroyed.

August. Powder flash in the Bethlehem Steel Co. Ten deaths. Explosion trainload of dynamite from Du Pont works at Pinole, Calif.

September. Explosion in the Curtiss Airplane plant at Depew, N. Y. Explosions in the shell factory of the National Cable & Conduit Co., at Hastings, N. Y. Explosion of benzol and wax in the plant of Smith & Lenhart, New York; two workers seriously injured. Explosion in fireworks factory at North Bergen, N. J.; two people killed. Explosion in the shell factory of the Westinghouse Electric Co. at Pittsburgh; two dead.

September-October. Repeated explosions at Du Pont plants, with extensive damage. Explosions at the plants of the Aetna Powder Co.

November. Two explosions in the Tennessee Coal & Iron Works at Birmingham, Ala., causing large property damage.

November 10. Fire in the plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. that destroyed 800 big guns. (All Germans warned beforehand.)

December. Explosion of ton and a half of nitroglycerin at Fayetteville, Ill.

December 10. Explosion at Hopewell, N. J., plant of the Du Pont powder works; \$2,000,000 worth of damage.

1916

January-April. Several major explosions in the Du Pont properties alone; dozens of lives lost. Explosion destroyed two arms plants in Bridgeport, Conn.

May. Explosion wiped out a large chemical plant in Cadillac, Mich. Explosion destroyed a munitions plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co., at New Castle, Pa.

August 1. Two million pounds of munitions blown up at Black Tom Island, in New York Harbor; \$30,000,000 damage.

1917

January 11. Fire and explosion in the shell-assembly plant of the Canadian Car & Foundry Co. near Kingsland, N. J.; half a million 3-inch shells discharged; \$17,000,000 damage to the plant and ammunition.

According to the German Secret Service in America, in 1915 a total of \$62,000,000 was charged to fires of unknown causes, in addition to \$6,200,000 paid out by insurance companies for incendiary fires. In 1916 this total jumped to over \$100,000,000 (p. 134).

One agent alone, Von Rintelen, boasted that he had been sent to America by the German general staff "backed by \$50,000,000—yes, \$100,000,000;" that he was "an agent plenipotentiary and extraordinary, ready to take any measure on land and sea to stop the making of munitions to halt their transportation at the factory or at the seaboard."

SUMMARY

This list shows a total of 53 major explosions and fires in American plants supplying arms and munitions of war to Allies before the United States entered the first World War.

Of this total, 33 explosions occurred in powder plants or on munitions trains. Twelve accidents happened in gun or shell plants. Chemical factories producing items used in war accounted for 7 explosions, while 1 disaster occurred in an airplane plant.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Just last night I learned that the Baltimore & Ohio is already guarding its bridges over the Ohio River between Ohio and West Virginia, and is not that as the result of such outrages as we had in 1917?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, finally, the question is whether we are going to be neutral or unneutral. What is neutrality? It is defined as "refraining from interference in a contest; friendly to each of two or more belligerents, or at least not taking part of either or any; as a neutral power."

Or it may be stated in the language of the authorities as follows:

The state of being neutral: The state of being a neutral nation during war. Neutrals may not lend money to either side, guarantee a loan, or allow the passage of belligerent troops through their borders.

Our Nation, which is neutral, should be steadfast in adhering to it and not be stirred from this position of security by any specious arguments or impassioned oratory. Strict neutrality and profits and advantages to one group of belligerents over another cannot be reconciled nor harmonized. I believe that strict neutrality is the surest, the safest, and the one means by which the United States can avoid war. To relax the rules, established during a period of peace, as a means of helping one group of belligerents to the injury of another belligerent group is anything but neutral conduct on our part. To alter the Neutrality Act as a means of financial gain shows a lack of honor and self-respect for the good name of our country.

I maintain that there is no vital national interest, profits or otherwise, to be gained by enacting sham legislation which is neither neutral in theory nor in fact. I was taught in high school that:

"This above all: To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

This applies to nations as well as to individuals.

The idea that the present European war is a war to end all wars ought to be weighed in the light of what Lord Allenby, the distinguished British general, said in his last message:

Wars have been usually waged, in olden days, for the spoils of victory; increase of territory, acquisition of wealth, even glory to the victor. The lust for expansion is not yet quite dead; but the glory of conquest is departing; its gains are dead sea fruit; its legacy, revengeful memories alone; hardening hearts, perpetuating anger, and leading on to the dreary round of renewed wars.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to direct the attention of the House to another much-debated phase of this proposed legislation. What is it that we wish to sell? Why not furnish a bill of particulars, that the public may know what the advocates of cash and carry wish to sell? Is this Christian Nation, under the term of neutrality, to deliver for cash or for credit these deadly poison gases: Chlorine, chloropicrin, phosgene tear gas, toxic smoke, and mustard gas? There is no doubt we can manufacture a new deadly product in the form of clay, impregnated with poison gas, which by a new diabolical system can be sprayed from the air in the form of powder.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen the victims of the more modern methods of taking human life, but I remember going into a British hospital at the front, and I saw the victims brought into a large room, about half as large as this Chamber. The cots were placed side by side, and oxygen gas was being administered to these boys who were fighting for one more breath. They were a long way from home. The wheezing and coughing of these poison-gas victims was enough to rack one's heart and soul. The lining of the nose had been eaten away. Many of the boys had no eyelids left, just their big, round eyes glaring and bulging from the pain of the poison gas. These were the boys who, 22 years ago, were fighting to end wars. I do not intend to lend my voice or my vote to any plan which proposes to engage in the manufacture and sale of these devilish, deadly, inhuman instrumentalities for mass murder.

So we are going in to sell that because there is a profit in it. Some may cry out, "Is it just to embargo the implements of mass murder when we can make profits from them? Is it just when these countries owe us and we have an opportunity to collect?" Oh, I would answer that in these words, that justice is a fine word, but it is not the last word between man and man.

To so order the world that every man receives a just wage will not bring the millennium. Who pays the mother for her long night vigil, the father for his toil, the soldier for his wounds, the hero for giving up his life to rescue another? Who paid Jesus for His agony, Regulus for his patriotism, and Walt Whitman for his poetry? Above all work done for fair pay towers the work done for no pay at all—just for love.

If we have a spark of love in our hearts at all for humanity, for innocent women and children, we will not seek profits by selling the instrumentalities of wholesale murder, and that is what we propose to do by lifting this embargo.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the profit that can be made by manufacturing and selling to our overseas neighbors the thermite bomb, weighing 5 pounds or less, which can be scattered over a city at large. A whole city, with favoring winds, can be destroyed by this instrument of refined cruelty. Thermite will burn through steel and through the successive floors of buildings so that modern architectural construction, only fireproof in the ordinary sense of the word, will be no adequate protection against it. It cannot be quenched with water. These are only a few of the sources of profit to be gained by becoming particeps criminis in a foreign war.

There should be no hypocrisy, no subterfuge, and no duplicity in dealing with this subject of neutrality. If it is the intention to favor one group of belligerents, then let the advocates of intervention be honest about it and say they wish to help one side whose cause they consider just. That will bring the issue clearly into the open where it belongs.

I maintain that the neutrality law is performing the function for which it was designed, whereas the old weapon of international law utterly failed in the World War. I listened intently for the President's explanation of his "conviction" that the repeal of the arms embargo would more probably keep us out of war. He said:

I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction . . . that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today. I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. REED of New York. Ask it now.

Mr. BULWINKLE. All right; I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman said he would insert in the Record a list of the industrial plants and other facilities destroyed by the Germans before we entered the last war. Why is the gentleman inserting that list in the Record?

Mr. REED of New York. Does not the gentleman perceive the logic of it? Does the gentleman mean to bring the war right into our country, a neutral country?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is the gentleman, then, inserting it in order that everybody may be fearful that if we pass this neutrality bill the Germans will again start on a course of sabotage in America?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, they will, and so will any other country to which we are unneutral.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then, in fear that someone might destroy our industries, we should stand supinely by and let them do what they please?

Mr. REED of New York. No; we should be neutral and not invite just that sort of thing, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What difference does it make if we refrain from shipping munitions of war already assembled if we permit the shipment to foreign countries of the necessary commodities and permit them to be manufactured over there?

Mr. REED of New York. The point is that if we are going to be neutral we must stop the shipment of the commodities that are declared to be contraband of war by the belligerent nations.

Mr. RICH. Would that include any commodities that might be used for the manufacture of anything that might endanger the lives of people after they are shipped from this country?

Mr. REED of New York. For wholesale slaughter; yes.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman would limit the shipment of all such commodities?

Mr. REED of New York. I would remain absolutely neutral. I do not know what the gentleman's interest is in shipping goods abroad, but I will say that all we shipped during 1916 and was just one-twentieth of 1 percent of our domestic and foreign commerce, just one-twentieth of 1 percent; and for that you would engage in wholesale slaughter of civilians abroad and bring the war to our own shores.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman referred to my attitude in making that statement, and I wish to say right here that if any manufacturing concern in this country is making profits out of war, I will be the first one to vote that no manufacturer in this country shall make a penny of profit out of any war commodity.

Mr. REED of New York. Good; I am glad to hear that.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania and Mr. PATRICK rose.

Mr. REED of New York. I have only 5 minutes; let me finish my statement. I say in answer that this safeguard can most certainly be accomplished without the repeal of the arms embargo. The two propositions have no relationship whatsoever to each other. I heartily agree with Senator VANDENBERG, who said, in answer to this proposal:

It is solely the question why, in God's name, is it necessary for us to reject a complete embargo upon munitions of war in order to accept what you propose? And I have yet to hear one side of a rational answer to the question.

Mr. Speaker, we, representing 130,000,000 people, have a responsibility, and one that is primarily ours and not that of any other branch of the Federal Government. That responsibility is to keep this country out of a foreign war, and, by so doing, preserve our liberties and our institutions. If we register the will of those whom we represent, we shall have their cooperation to that end. I can find no more appropriate words in which to define our responsibility than those used by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, who served with the Australian Imperial Force for the period of the World War, and who was major of Military Intelligence Reserve of the United States Army from 1922 to 1930. He said:

In this country we have a very great responsibility—a responsibility to which it is difficult to believe the American people will be found insensible. That responsibility is to keep alive in this world the torch of human liberty when elsewhere that light is being ruthlessly trodden out. We can do that; we can carry out this responsibility because a merciful Providence has favored this country with a geographical position which enables us to defend ourselves with the weapons of sea power which are historically weapons that a free people may wield without peril to their liberty.

If, however, we throw away these advantages, if we again undertake military adventures of a type calling for the regimentation of every aspect of national life and resources, if we attempt to go again to other continents to settle the affairs of other peoples with great armies and the great measure of shipping necessary to maintain those armies overseas, we shall be abandoning the responsibility which is ours, and which, first of all, consists in making secure our own freedom, our own democracy, our institutions, and our way of life. We must realize that in Europe, where a number of nations live side by side on a comparatively small continent, there is nothing we can do to contribute to a permanent settlement of European affairs. We can only produce a new set of combinations out of which, in turn, will presently arise the beginnings of a new war. We cannot settle the affairs of Europe in a manner which justifies the expenditure of life and treasure that it would cost us.

The affairs of Europe can be settled only when the peoples of Europe have made up their minds that war is not worth while. But we cannot convince them of that. They will have to convince themselves. The only policy for the American people to adopt may be stated in these words: "The affairs of Europe and Asia must be settled by the peoples who live there; the affairs of the Americas shall be settled by the people who live here, and by no one else."

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement I made this morning before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein the statement he submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Attorney General of the United States, last Friday evening, before a conference on civil liberties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the McConnelville, Ohio, Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter I received from Mr. Goodloe, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, dated October 14, a letter which he addressed to certain warehousemen, dated October 7, and a cotton storage contract.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Portland Spectator on neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I think I should offer an apology to this body for asking recognition on the floor at so early a time in my first session. I realize, of course, that ordinarily a new Member should listen and learn in this body for a longer period than I have before endeavoring to offer his views and arguments for or against pending measures. However, as a new member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as a Member of this body, and as a citizen, I am deeply and vitally interested in the neutrality legislation.

I trust therefore, Mr. Speaker, that these considerations will outweigh in your mind and in the minds of the Members any feeling that may exist as to the impropriety of my rising at this time.

The request, Mr. Speaker, that I am about to make at this point has been mentioned to the two gentlemen who follow me under special orders and they have no objection. I ask unanimous consent at this point that my time be extended so that I may have a total of 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Another consideration that impelled me to speak is the disclosure made on the floor of the House the other day that some forty-odd Republican Members of this body and one Democrat, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] have

organized themselves into a committee, styled the National Committee To Keep Us Out of Foreign Wars. The headquarters of this organization being in the House Office Building, and the stationery used being, to some extent at least, official, the public may easily believe that this self-appointed committee has some official standing. This committee or bureau, or whatever it may be properly called, is broadcasting appeals for money to be used, it is admitted, for propaganda purposes to try to browbeat those of us who do not see eye to eye with them as to how to keep us out of war, into their point of view. I do not impugn the motives of these gentlemen. They are honorable men and honestly followed the dictates of their consciences, I am sure.

But they are endeavoring to set themselves up as the only patriots in this body and the only Members whose high ambition it is to keep this country out of war. I resent such action, and with letters from this committee going into my district I could not keep silent and maintain my self-respect. And when the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOODRUM], whose statesmanship and ability is known throughout the Nation, took this alliance to task on the floor the other day for degrading the dignity of this body, their only answer was the unwarranted suggestion that he was estopped to speak because, forsooth, he had not fought in the World War, as well he should not have in view of the important public position he then held.

If a personal reference will be excused, I will match records for patriotism with any member of that so-called committee. I served in the last war as a private and an officer in an infantry regiment that saw 6 months of fighting at the front. Out of the first 100 officers we took into the line, 74 were killed or wounded, and casualties among the enlisted men ran to almost 50 percent. I know what war is, and I hate war with every fiber of my being. I hope that no American will ever again be called on to stand on foreign soil, beneath steel-throbbing skies, to see the earth battered to pieces beneath the hammer strokes of the howitzers and to see high explosives tear and mangle and kill human beings.

Furthermore, in my recent campaign for a seat in this body I told my constituents, and here renew the pledge, that I will never vote to send America into this war unless further developments bring about a cause so just and righteous in my mind that immediately on voting for war I will myself enlist in the armed forces of the country.

With that indication of the sincerity of my desire to preserve peace for this country, you can understand my resentment at the action of this partisan, political National Committee To Keep Us Out of Foreign Wars in advising my constituents, in effect, that I am by my attitude on this legislation trying to embroil America in the war in Europe.

Referring now to the neutrality bill that will come to us for consideration shortly, I have been astonished at the light and airy manner with which this subject has been treated by some in both Houses. On the Senate side newspapers quote statesmen there as saying "we are going to fight this thing from hell to breakfast." There, and in this House, too, Members have been quoted as seriously advancing the amazing argument that "we must not change the rules during the progress of the game," all as though a football contest is being fought or rules being prescribed for a tennis match. As we debate this subject here men are dying horribly by the thousands. Our action on this bill may affect the future of all the people of Europe, and it strikes me that arguments made by these men with hearts so little attuned to the tragedy and doom of the day should be lightly considered in this debate.

There has been as much or more misrepresentation about this bill, intentional and unintentional, I dare say, than about any other bill ever before the Congress. While at home, between the sessions, I took the opportunity of explaining in detail through the press of my district the bill we considered last session—practically the same as the bill that will shortly come to us. Then I visited the 12 counties of my district. I represent a rural district in Tennessee, called the Volunteer State, because in every war it has supplied more than its quota of volunteers, but a State whose citizenship abhors war. The people of my district are intelligent and cultured.

Some of the finest schools in the South are located there, and there are few homes that do not have the benefit of the radio and daily papers. It is a fair cross section of the real America, uninfluenced by aliens and rabble rousers, and thinking for itself. I contacted people in all walks of life—merchants, bankers, men of general business, professional men, farmers, and laborers. It may seem to you an exaggeration, but I give my solemn word that I did not find a single human being that did not favor the enactment of the principle of the proposed bill. Since my return to Washington I have not received a single letter from my district asking me to vote in the negative. I hear other Members of this body speak of the hundreds of letters requesting a negative vote. A few of them, of course, are from people who honestly voice their own sentiments, but in the light of my experience I firmly believe that 95 percent of these letters are from people who do not understand the situation and have been inspired to write by misdirected zealots or from people favoring Germany in this war through considerations of blood or affinity.

Leaving aside the arms-embargo feature of the proposed bill for the present, to defeat it would be to leave this country in a position best calculated to lead us into war, for under the law now existing American ships can carry any commodity under the sun, even articles declared contraband, right into the ports of the warring nations, except arms, ammunition, and munitions of war. It was that privilege to American shippers that led directly to our entrance into the last war. As was stated here by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] a few days ago, under the German unrestricted submarine warfare 26 of our ships were sunk, and when our national pride could endure it no longer we declared war. Only one of those ships carried anything resembling munitions of war. Some carried wheat, some timber, some assorted cargoes, but not munitions of war. As the law now exists, with German submarines roaming the seas again, and with our ships putting out daily with cargoes on the German contraband list, we are in an easy way to go exactly the same route that we went in 1917.

The proposed law stops that and prevents our ships from passing through or into combat areas, but permits the warring nations to come here in their own ships and buy whatever we have to sell on a cash-and-carry basis; and with agricultural conditions as they are and industrial conditions as well, with the list of unemployed of staggering size, certainly our farmers and our manufacturers need to sell. Our shipping industry must make a sacrifice, of course, but it is necessary to keep us out of war and therefore well worth while.

Objection is made that there is a 90-day credit feature in the new bill. In business circles everywhere 90 days is almost equivalent to cash, and in large transactions some time must be given for transfer of credits, clearances, and the like. But there is the provision that should a nation default on one such extension, no further sale will be made during the default. In the emergency the warring nations confront, that provision will be a penalty so severe that, in my opinion, there will be no default.

It is said that the cash feature will not avail us because England and France are unable to buy on such terms. Nothing could be further from the real facts. According to the current monthly review of the National City Bank of New York, England has some four and one-half billions in gold and dollar assets and France three and one-half billions, and this could be supplemented by their sale of securities internally to an almost unlimited amount.

Another likely cause of our entry into the war would be the taking of American lives by one of the warring nations. The proposed bill carries over the feature prohibiting the travel by Americans on ships of warring nations and prohibits any American, and, of course, any American passenger ship, from passing through or into the combat areas. Another sacrifice of our national right, of course; but in a good cause.

I do not believe the mind of man could have fashioned any two prohibitions more certainly destined to keep down the

possibility of our being forced into declaring war in the present world crisis.

That part of the public opposing the bill surely cannot understand these two component features of it. They have been the subject of propaganda solely on the feature of the bill repealing the arms embargo, and now let me discuss that for a moment.

I am sincere in my conviction that the failure of Congress at the last session to repeal the arms embargo was a contributing factor to Hitler's brutal and destructive march on Poland. He had been preparing for war steadily for 10 years or more. He had purchased some munitions from us. He knew that from Russia, Hungary, Rumania, from Italy, Finland, Holland, and Belgium he could buy in times of war other war material as he needed it. He had taken over entirely the armed establishment of what had been Austria and Czechoslovakia, and with our failure to repeal the arms embargo he knew that England and France, largely unprepared, especially the former, in their pursuit of peace and happiness in the years past, not looking for and not wanting war, could not purchase a single defensive gun, a single defensive round of ammunition, a single defensive airplane from us—and so he struck. I may be wrong, of course, but I believe as surely as I stand here that had we listened to the President and the Secretary of State at the last session and repealed this measure, proud Poland would be free today and Warsaw would not be in shambles.

From a legal standpoint, the embargo cannot be defended. Not only is it contrary to the custom and usage of this country for 150 years, condemned by statesmen and leaders from Alexander Hamilton to Theodore Roosevelt, but it is not sanctioned by international law.

The Hague Convention, at the conference of 1907, in which England, France, Germany, and America, with dozens of other nations participated, resolved thus on this subject:

A neutral power is not called upon to prevent the export or transport on behalf of one or other of the belligerents, of arms, munitions of war, or in general of anything which may be of use to any army or fleet.

That is a treaty that all nations participating in the conference signed and solemnly declared it to be the law of the nations. Why are we now called on to revise it, especially when such revision is against the interests of the nations that have our sympathy and in favor of the nation whose government and present rulers we despise, condemn, and abhor?

The works of John Bassett Moore are recognized as the leading and outstanding authorities on international law. He was, as you know, once our Assistant Secretary of State, our observer at the World Court, and among other places of distinction that he filled, strangely enough, was that of the Hamilton Fish professorship of international law and diplomacy at Columbia University, as reference to the flyleaf in any of his books will show. That was a chair and professorship endowed, doubtless, by the illustrious father of our present distinguished colleague from New York by the same name and a member of our committee.

Judge Moore has this to say on the subject:

If the sale of munitions of war is to be held a breach of neutrality "instantly upon the declaration of war between the two belligerents, not only the traffic by sea of all the rest of the neutral powers of the world would be exposed to the inconveniences of which they are already impatient, but the whole inland trade of every nation of the earth which has hitherto been free will be cast into fetters. . . . It would give to the belligerent the right of interference of every act of neutral domestic commerce till at last the burden would be so enormous that neutrality itself would become more intolerable than war and the result of this assumed reform professing to be founded on the principles of eternal justice would be nothing less than universal and interminable hostilities."

For not only the vendor of the iron would have to be prevented from selling to the vendor of the gun, but the miner and machinist would have to be prevented from working for the vendor of the iron. A neutral sovereign would therefore either have to stop all machinery by which munitions of war could be produced for belligerent use or expose himself to a call for whatever damages his failure to do so might have caused either belligerent. Under such circumstances it would be far more economical and polite to plunge into war as a belligerent than to keep out of it as a neutral.

Another eminent authority, Charles Noble Gregory, has this to say upon the subject:

Such a change of law and practice . . . magnifies the power of the prepared and predatory states, and it hinders and prevents the defense of the pacific states. It helps the carnivorous states, and it hurts the herbivorous states, as it were. It sharpens the fangs of the wolf, constantly used in attack, and it takes away the antlers of the stag, as constantly used for defense alone. It tends to embroil the nations and to destroy their balance and repose. It is a pernicious, unwise, and immoral restraint, an injurious change in a just rule.

It is submitted that our people have a right by all laws, international and municipal, to manufacture and freely sell to all comers munitions of war (except when restrained for special circumstances by special laws, as along our southern border); that this right is founded not merely on the long-established customs of all nations, including our own, on the opinions of statesmen, judges, and scholars and on the express agreement of the nations at the last Hague Conference, but it rests upon considerations of wise and necessary policy, salutary for all peaceful nations and hostile to predatory nations; that it ought, therefore, to be fully preserved and fully exercised for the welfare and safety of all nations seeking to avoid the extremes of militarism, and to devote themselves, without sacrifice of security, to pursuits of peace; that in adhering to, maintaining, and exercising such a right we pursue a policy hostile to no nation and vital to the safety of our own.

Another well-recognized authority, Prof. John Westlake, sets the proposition out in this language:

Wars now are sudden as conflagrations in their origin and the advantages of preparation and initiative are immense. Why make them vastly greater? Why tempt to secret preparation and sudden aggression by greatly reducing the resources and avails of the defending power? Why aid the wolf and hamstring the lamb? Why, by a change of law and policy, aid and encourage the predatory policy and debilitate defense? Such change must stimulate war and discourage peace.

It is therefore opposed to the general interest of mankind and the present rule is wiser and more pacific, tending to maintain the safety and stability of the nations whose main employments are in the peaceful arts.

I have had on my desk in the past week all the books on international law available at the Library of Congress, and I have found that principle challenged in none of them.

But the argument is advanced that everything else aside to change our law after the war has started would be an unneutral act. In the first place no foreign nation, at war or at peace, can complain about any domestic law that we pass or repeal in peacetime or in wartime. No nation obtained any vested rights by our passage of the present arms embargo. In passing that law we made no contract with them. The legislation was a law governing our own citizens, not a treaty with the nations of the world. In repealing the arms embargo we are not taking sides to any greater extent than we are taking sides now. We are simply saying, by repeal, to all the nations of the world, come and get whatever we have to sell and whatever you can buy, pay for, and carry away. If England and France can come to better advantage, that is no concern of ours. We did not build their navies nor prevent Germany from having a navy equally effective. If it operates to the advantage of France and England to repeal the embargo and permit them to buy munitions here, Germany cannot complain for she already has access by land to purchase arms of a dozen other neutral countries within the sphere of her influence—access to which is denied the Allies. But at the last and in the end, granting that the repeal does help England and France and hurt Germany, I, for one, say "Thank God it does." In the end these democracies in their fight are protecting us. But for the French Army to restrain Hitler at the Maginot line and the English Navy to restrain him on the seas, can any man doubt that we might, indeed, be dragged into war and a defensive war at that? Lifting of the embargo is the best insurance on earth that we can take out for our own peace and security. The sale of arms will not drag us into war. In the World War dozens of nations sold munitions to the belligerents and remained neutral. In the last 2 years we have sold munitions to Japan and China and have not been dragged into their quarrel.

The only agency that can ever put us into war is this Congress by its vote, and as long as this body maintains its equilibrium no war can come.

LXXXV—31

The people of America honestly opposing the lifting of the arms embargo base their opposition largely, I think, upon the theory that it is inhuman, in time of war, to sell to any nation arms for the destruction of human life. That idea is not sound. Sometimes it may be the humane thing to do. In the language of one of the authorities that I quoted, is it humane to sharpen the fangs of the wolf before the attack and then deny succor to the lamb in which he sinks his teeth? Germany bought munitions from us in time of peace. We knew for what use every purchase was destined. Is it proper to sell to a nation to enable it to prepare for war and reprehensible to sell to an unprepared country when attacked?

Furthermore, we can sell to the warring nations everything on earth that goes into the manufacture of munitions. We can sell cotton, zinc, lead, brass, manganese, copper, steel—everything necessary for war purposes, and all the warring nations need do is to buy it and when they get it home, process and assemble the component parts. I cannot for the life of me see the difference between selling wood for the stock of a rifle and steel for the barrel and selling the gun complete, or brass for the base and lead for the point and cotton to make the powder, and the cartridge complete. The only difference is that we lose the value of the processing and manufacture. We have 10,000,000 unemployed, but with the lifting of the embargo I believe that industry would absorb the most of them. Shall we tell them to just sit around and starve, or go on relief—that we are too good to make airplanes and guns and cartridges and shells, but we are hypocritical enough to sell everything necessary for their manufacture abroad?

And let me make this suggestion: To repeal the embargo and permit our industries to continue the manufacture of airplanes, guns, and ammunition, but geared to a high production basis, would be a great step forward in our national defense. Should an emergency arise for us, there is the whole organization, experienced, efficient, and ready to fill the needs of our Government to the full limit of the demand.

This Nation is as unprepared for war today, proportionately speaking, as it was in 1917. Should we be forced into war, it would take us now, as it did then, a solid year of feverish activity by day and night, entailing the waste of billions, before an American Army would be in shape to strike a single effective blow against a well-equipped adversary. To have a far-flung system of industry geared to mass production of munitions would be a long step toward real preparation.

In conclusion, there is one argument advanced by the isolationists of this day that makes me wince when I hear it. Invariably they refer to our participation in the last war. They mention the hundred thousand dead, the billions lost in treasure, and they say America and the world gained nothing from our participation in the conflict. I will concede that to be true. I will go them a measure better and say that we should never have entered the World War. But once in the war, and the dead having died, and the billions having vanished, who is responsible that no good resulted from our sacrifices? The fault lies with the isolationists and the partisans in Congress of that day. Had the peace of 1918 been followed, as President Wilson urged, by a strong, representative League of Nations and a World Court, with America lending her great weight and prestige, I maintain that the dozen wars fought since would have been settled about the council table before issue was taken on the battlefield.

I was on detached service in Paris during the Peace Conference and had occasion to see President Wilson as he moved from group to group assembled there, his face shining with the high ideal and noble purpose of writing the sacrifice of our dead into a covenant that would bring a new era of peace. And then I saw him a few months later in Washington, when the fruits of victory had been snatched away by the isolationists and the partisans of the day, and a pitiable spectacle of a man he was, that, broken with the realization

that his dead had died in vain, walked with shuffling step and drooping mouth toward his grave.

I am no internationalist and I know that the League and World Court are dead issues never to be revived, but when the opponents of this measure, the isolationists and partisans, seek to buttress their argument with the fact that we gained nothing from the last war, I remember why we did not gain anything and discredit that argument accordingly.

The stand that America should take today is to say to the warring nations, "Your war is not ours, we will have none of it, but in accordance with our custom and usage for 150 years, in accordance with our national dignity and the law of nations, recognized since time out of mind, we are ready to sell to all of you whatever you can buy, pay for, and transport." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BEAM]. Under special order heretofore made, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FINLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted the indulgence of the House, I shall quote a very short speech which I delivered at the Finland day celebration at the world's fair on June 24 last:

Mr. Commissioner General. Your Excellency, the Minister from Finland, and all others of high rank participating in this Finland day celebration at the world's fair in New York. As a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, one of the greatest deliberative bodies in the world, I have perceived with satisfaction and extreme pleasure that the two great democracies of Finland and the United States are striving toward the same goal of social justice coupled with liberty under the law. The emblems of these two countries, more than any other, float in the breeze side by side having been conceived on common ground.

The principles of democracy and freedom so dear to the hearts of the people of Finland and the United States of America have their roots in religion. God is our master. Through Christian spirit, with the help of Almighty God, we have established the greatest form of government known to man. Freedom of press, freedom of speech, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, is ours. These we now have and shall keep in Finland and the United States of America just so long as we pledge ourselves that God in His divine mercy will be our guiding light. The whole world is in a turmoil. We hear a cry for neutrality. Neutrality is a state of mind. It cannot be legislated but can be brought about only through the practice of Christian principles and friendship such as is enjoyed between the peoples of the United States of America and Finland.

Although the Finnish language is so very different from ours there are so many other common interests and ties between the two peoples that this has never been a barrier between us. Those of us in America who are familiar with the innumerable fine qualities of the Finns, those of us who have lived among them in America and who are acquainted with the many great contributions they have made to the cultural and public life of our country are proud to point to Finland as the country in Europe where the humanitarian and intellectual principles of liberty and justice are working in reality.

I am grateful for this opportunity to again express my friendship and feelings toward Finland. It is my sincere prayer to Almighty God that the friendly spirit which prevails in both nations last through the ages and that democracy in its unalloyed supremacy shall be ours forever. We are at peace with the world and at peace we shall remain.

It is not my intention, this afternoon, to discuss the technicalities of the neutrality bill as it has been presented to the Senate of the United States or to, in any way, comment upon any of the arguments raised by either side in this most important debate. I need not review the events leading up to the present crisis because that has been covered more eloquently and forcefully than I could hope to do in the few minutes allotted to me this afternoon. I must, however, reiterate that I am still of the opinion that neutrality is a question of policy, not legislation. It is a state of mind. In order to remain neutral we must remain friendly to all nations. We may lay down the rules of what may or may not be done during a conflict between belligerent nations but in the final analysis the people themselves, in their hearts and minds, determine the policy of neutrality; yes, they determine the policy of this or any other nation. The Congress and the administration officials are bound together under one solemn promise—that we shall do everything humanly possible to remain out of any foreign conflict, free from foreign entanglements. It is my most ardent hope that we will strengthen

our neutrality policy to the point where we will be safely neutral, to the extent that we will definitely and positively keep out of this war. We must not allow the ideologies of the imperialistic groups in Europe to, in any way, become implanted on this continent. War is a horrible thing, and having worn a uniform in the last war, I will do everything in my power to see that we keep completely out of this war. We should realize our mistakes in the last conflict and act accordingly. There seems to be a division of thought as to how we are to remain neutral. I believe that both schools of thought have one thing in mind, and that is that we keep out of war. If we keep paramount in our minds the fact that we must remain neutral, I feel certain that it can and will be done. As I have stated, neutrality, after all, is a matter of policy which must be set up so that we may meet the changing conditions of the world, because what may be a neutral act today may be an overt act tomorrow. What may be neutral zones on the high seas today may be war zones tomorrow. Therefore, we should not do anything that, in a mandatory way, would stifle and tie the hands of those who hold the responsibility of keeping this Nation neutral and at peace. I may question the judgment of some, and they may question mine but, nevertheless, I cannot question their patriotism or their sincerity to remain neutral and at peace.

From 1914 to 1918 a World War was fought, supposedly, to keep the world safe for democracy. Democracy is a form of government developed in the hearts and the minds of men and women working in the best interests of all the people. During the horrible conflict that was waged in the last war, when men and women on both sides of the Atlantic fought and died on the battlefields, certain nations in Europe remained neutral and at peace. Those nations are traditionally neutral and they can be. They have demonstrated their love of peace. They are the Scandinavian countries in and around the Baltic. The United States of America stretches out a friendly gesture to all nations, and it is the ardent prayer in the heart of every American citizen that peace shall soon be a reality in the world. The United States always has had friendly relations with Russia, both diplomatically and commercially. We ardently hope that that friendship will remain. Out of the conflict of the World War came the fact that many nations became indebted to the United States of America. Among those was the newly founded Republic of Finland and, of all nations, that nation has kept her contractual obligations, and has paid her debts on time.

Finland is the neighbor of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Russia. Thus geographically she forms the border between east and west. Finland has through the ages contributed to the benefits of civilization. She has always turned her gaze toward the west and the south. The Baltic Sea has linked her to the outer world, and, although Finland was connected with Russia for over 100 years as an autonomous grand duchy, she never lost her western traits or her national traditions. The United States and Finland have much in common. They are lovers of independence, freedom, and democracy; lovers of peace and progress. Upon the achievement of national independence, Finland drew up a free constitution for herself, and it was democratic United States that provided the model that the legislators followed in many respects. In fact, the relation of the United States and Finland dates back many years even to the extent of blood relationship stretching back for hundreds of years. The swift development of Finland in industry and government has earned the admiration of the rest of the world. Democratic friendship and democratic spirit, as I have stated before, is born in the hearts and the minds of the people. That spirit knows no distance; space is no obstacle. A friendly tie exists and a friendship for Finland has rested in the hearts and the minds of every free-thinking, liberty-loving person in the United States. It is our ardent hope that these liberty-loving, peace-loving people be allowed to live and enjoy life without any interference of any imperialistic government.

It may be well at this time to relate a little of the historical and geographical background which has led up to the present situation in the Baltic. As I stated before, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark have enjoyed the friendship of all nations and

commerce with all nations because of freedom of the Baltic. Finland has always enjoyed these privileges. Like a row of stepping stones from Sweden to Finland across the Gulf of Bothnia, the Aaland Islands occupy a key position. They command both the entrance of the Gulf of Finland, Russia's only ice-free outlet to western Europe, and also the route to the northern Swedish iron mines and Finland's aluminum works. These Aaland Islands after the World War were claimed by Sweden and Finland and were awarded to Finland in 1920 by the League of Nations. In 1921 an international convention decreed the perpetual neutralization and demilitarization of the islands. The signatories to this were Britain, France, Italy, and all the states around the Baltic except Russia. Last year Finland opened negotiations with Sweden to arrange a partial refortification of the islands as a measure of their mutual protection and as a part of a plan to safeguard the independence of the north. Agreement was reached in January, and the two countries then sought permission of the signatories of the 1921 convention to carry it into effect. The last of the signatories to reply was Germany, who in May gave consent but added:

The neutrality of Finland and Sweden in the case of any warlike development affecting the Baltic is a self-evident condition.

It is of factual interest today for all American citizens to observe and evaluate the recent discussions between Finland and Russia. It is of extreme importance that the position of the United States and the feelings and sentiments of our people be fully and completely understood by the world at large.

We can discuss neutrality here on the floor of this House—our people can study and debate the problem day after day—and still one vital factor will never be reached in the debates. This factor, to my mind, is the emotional reaction of our people to any aggressive actions made by any imperialistic power against that sturdy little democracy—Finland.

Our relations with Russia, even though we do not believe in her philosophy of government, have been and, I hope, will continue to be most friendly and cordial. I know that it is the sincere desire of our country to maintain this friendly relationship. I hope that nothing will occur in the Baltic which will in any way so affect the feelings of our people that will damage this relationship. Russia surely knows that any overt act toward Finland will not be pleasant to the American people.

We, more than any people on earth, know and love democracy. We have in our Government processes developed the highest degree of freedom of thought and action for the individual, a government which manifests in its every action the will of its people. These things have been said time and again far more eloquently than I could hope to express them. They cannot, however, be called to mind too often.

It is difficult to present calmly a definite and reassuring formula of American public opinion. We are painfully aware of the rapid changes in public moods and sentiments. At this time every single American is striving to follow the developments in Europe with studied calmness and without undue alarm. So far it has been a magnificent demonstration of the capabilities of our democracy. We know that America's historic contribution to political thought and practice is in our ability to maintain and safeguard the fundamental rights of individuals.

It is only natural that our sympathies lie with countries whose political ideals and thinking is close to our own. It is only natural that we should and do admire those thoughts and practices when they are manifested in other countries.

I am wondering if Russia is completely aware of the strong attachment the people of America feel and have felt toward Finland. We cannot legislate feeling and emotion out of the hearts of Americans. Nor do I for a moment think that any Member of this House believes that we can. The strong feeling of friendship that exists between the United States and Finland should be well recognized throughout the world. This friendship should not be taken too lightly by imperialistic nations bent on extending their power over a smaller neighbor.

There is no doubt of the sincerity on the part of the Baltic states to remain neutral and friendly throughout any conflict. That has been admirably demonstrated.

I might further state that Finland has developed a social-welfare program that is the envy of many people of the world. They fully realize that only in peacetime can they continue to develop the home and the farm that is the backbone of this wonderful little country.

It is rather a phenomenal thing that the American people should in such a short time develop a feeling and friendship toward Finland to such an extent that any interference with her liberty might arouse the emotions of the American people to such an extent that it might endanger our friendship with nations that we sincerely hope to remain friendly with. It is the sincere desire and hope of the people of the United States of America that the Baltic situation may be amicably settled to the satisfaction of all concerned so that Sweden, Norway, Finland, and all others desiring peace may be free to carry on in the interest of humanity and justice as they have in the past. It is our sincere hope that Russia will not do anything that will impair the friendship that exists between the Baltic states, and especially Finland, with the United States. I am especially proud of the fact that the responsible officials of the United States have conveyed to Russia our friendly feelings to our friendly neighbor, the Republic of Finland. Let us hope that Russia will respect the wishes of the Western Hemisphere that Finland be allowed to remain at peace so that a free people may continue in its struggle for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the other addresses today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the reading of the Journal and the conclusion of the legislative program for the day, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman expect to use the time allotted to him today?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes on Friday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A COUNTRY SICK OF STRIKES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I shall read an article taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, October 15, 1939, entitled "A Country Sick of Strikes."

A COUNTRY SICK OF STRIKES

How much longer must this country continue to endure constant turmoil in industry, retarding prosperity and throwing numberless skilled workers out of jobs?

How much longer, at a time when 10,000,000 men and women, hungry for work, can't find it, are additional thousands and hundreds of thousands to be denied employment through unnecessary strikes?

How much longer must a large segment of American industry and American workmen continue to live and succeed only by grace of the C. I. O. and John L. Lewis, imperious labor czar, who, among other distinctions, has the questionable honor of fathering that ugly brace of illegitimate union weapons, the sit-down and the slow-down strikes?

We don't know. But we do know that the American people are sick and tired of it all. We believe that to a constantly increasing extent public sympathy with strikes, touched off here, there, and everywhere by unscrupulous labor leaders with the bland unconcern of a man ordering a sandwich, is being alienated.

The right to strike is basic and unquestioned. Men forced to toll excessive hours for inadequate pay or made to suffer under intolerable working conditions have an indubitable right to stop work until their reasonable demands are met.

There are strikes that are wholly justifiable. There are employers with whom no other form of argument is effective. But of the 2,772 strikes in the United States last year, involving 688,000 workers and resulting in 9,000,000 man-days of idleness, a large proportion appeared to be totally unwarranted and unnecessary.

When the strike is used as a knotted club to enforce demands that are not reasonable, when it is employed with scant discrimination by power-fattened union bosses seeking not only to tighten their grip on the workers they so crudely misrepresent but to extend their stifling control over industry as well, then the strike becomes something more than a nuisance—it is a definite menace to the peace and security of the country.

Latest of major industrial conflicts is that which has thrown 40,000 men out of work in the Chrysler automobile plants and 15,000 more in the body plants of the Briggs Co. On the eve of negotiations for a new contract with the Chrysler Corporation, C. I. O. workers adopted a new form of sabotage—for it was nothing less—called the slow-down.

Every second unit on the assembly line went past them untouched, causing a 50-percent cut in production. Their excuse was that production had been speeded up unduly. The company, denying the charge, closed the plants, and the union later filed a formal 5-day notice of a strike, a procedure compulsory under Michigan law.

According to union spokesmen, the notification set forth a demand that the union shall have a voice hereafter in the framing of promotion schedules.

Is that a reasonable demand?

We hold no brief for the Chrysler Corporation, but regardless of the merits of the present situation there will be general agreement that its president, K. T. Keller, is justified in this statement: "You cannot run a business on a sound basis and produce quality automobiles if men tell their foremen what they will do and what they will not do. You cannot permit them to take into their own hands the running of the plants."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the strike in the Chrysler plant to which the article refers, where 55,000 men are out of work, one of the demands is that the union, through Mr. Frankenstein, control the limited production.

Mr. RICH. That is what this news article states. It states that it is contrary to all common sense; it is to the detriment of labor and to the detriment of the plant and the detriment of the public generally.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the wage there is 40 percent higher than the average wage in the United States in all industrial work.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree. I shall continue with the article:

Grant the union's contention that John Lewis or any insolent labor tycoon has the right to impose upon producers his take-it-or-leave-it decrees in any matters relating not to labor but to management, and you have a fine candid-camera picture of the camel's head slipping under the tent.

What is it all leading to? We know what the vicious sit-down strike did to industry and to the peace and order of the country. Is the slow-down the forerunner of another wave of industrial disorder, with the purpose back of it to dictate, starting with production schedules, every detail of management?

As buying capacity increases, and the demand for new goods is stepped up, and we see some slight chance to dig ourselves out of the quicksands of depression, is production to be impeded, or halted altogether, by demands no business can accede to and continue to live?

At a time when we are making heroic efforts to build up the Nation's defenses, against the possibility of aggression directed against us in a world on fire, will Army and Navy orders for essential mechanical equipment be held up by strikes—slow-down, sit-down, or what have you?

Are we to be given the Hobson's choice of letting labor dictators like John Lewis take over American industry with an iron hand, rule and ruin it, or experience another campaign of destruction, rioting, and bloodshed like the one that brought large sections of this country to the verge of anarchy in the summer of 1937?

Perhaps not. We devoutly hope not. But let those of short memories be reminded that even in our own State of Pennsylvania, just 2 short years ago, the C. I. O. strong-arm tactics in the Johnstown steel-mills strike were such that property was wantonly damaged and human lives placed in jeopardy, while a Democratic State administration, subservient to John L. Lewis, first stood by complacently and then closed the mills, so that men willing to work couldn't work.

What hope is there today for a return to peace in industry? Can nothing be done to improve a situation fraught with danger to the best interests of labor as well as industry?

One step that could not fail to provide a sounder basis for industrial relations would be the drastic amendment, or, better still, the complete rewriting, of the Wagner Labor Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; provided I can get a couple of minutes more time to finish this article?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be permitted to have an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. FRIES]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman seen this dispatch under date of October 12, the Associated Press, from San Francisco, to the effect that the C. I. O. shouts condemnation of the Labor Board? Does the gentleman know that John Lewis is against the Labor Board?

Mr. RICH. I think the C. I. O. is just camouflaging the issue, because the Labor Board seems to be working pretty well with the C. I. O. They have gotten everything from them that anybody could desire, right and wrong alike. I think that is only camouflage or a smoke screen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This resolution from the C. I. O. international convention at San Francisco says that the C. I. O. brands the adoption of such policies and such displacement of personnel as unwarranted and an unworthy retreat by the Board.

Mr. RICH. I would say to the gentleman that anything the C. I. O. stands for I am against. For it will ultimately ruin labor, business, and the country. They have too many Communists in their midst in responsible positions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the gentleman surely does not mean that.

Mr. RICH. The C. I. O. stands for the wrecking of the American form of government. I think it would do anything to make this a communistic Nation, and anyone who is for making this anything but a constitutional form of government I am against—I don't care whether he sits in the White House or anywhere else. I am for constitutional government—freedom of press, freedom of radio, freedom of speech, and religious freedom.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman make a distinction between what the C. I. O. says and what it wants or does?

Mr. RICH. I have no confidence in the C. I. O. or anything that it stands for. I say to the Congress that we should not wait until January 3 next to start legislation to revise the Wagner Act and get a new labor law. The editorial continues:

Purporting to be an instrument whose purposes is "to remove the causes of industrial disputes" it is directly responsible for fomenting disputes and encouraging the calling of superfluous strikes.

The Labor Board, set up under the provisions of this act, is judge, jury, and prosecutor. Prosecutor of whom? Of the employer and only the employer every time.

The oft-reiterated charge that the Board as constituted is arbitrary and unfair in its rulings has received abundant support in numberless cases. But no Board could administer real justice while operating under the Wagner Labor Act, because that law is grossly unfair, one-sided, and discriminatory.

We have said it before and we repeat now that there will be no enduring peace in American industry until we have a new labor law and a new labor board.

If Congress fails to meet this situation at the beginning of its next regular session, it will not only be derelict in the performance of a paramount duty, but it will have to bear the responsibility for a continuance of industrial conditions which have become utterly intolerable.

Sooner or later these questions will have to be answered and answered right:

Is the industrial structure of the United States, upon which the life and prosperity of the country are dependent, to be placed completely under the dominion of a handful of self-constituted overlords of labor, to do with as they like at the point of a gun?

Or are the people, through their representatives in Government, going to enact a sound law covering industrial relations—and enforce it?

That is the vital question. Let me read that again. As the majority leader is in the hall listening, I want him to

act, and act now, and not do as stated at the last session of Congress, "There will be no labor legislation at this session." I hope that the fine gentleman, one of the men whom we all like and honor and love, will see that it is necessary that we change the law, because we all like SAM RAYBURN. [Applause.] We know that he is a man who will do things if we can only start him. [Laughter.] We are hoping that he will start this legislation.

Now, let me repeat this: "Or are people, through their representatives in government, going to enact a sound law covering industrial relations, and enforce it?"

That is the question the people of America want to have answered. That is the question I hope this Congress will answer for the American people, so that we can have an enduring peace between capital and labor, between the workmen and the employers; because, after all is said and done, you cannot have continued strikes in industry and expect industry to succeed. Industry is sick. Industry has just about reached the point where it is giving up. When it quits creating jobs, then what? It is a serious situation. Yesterday I talked to a man who has been in the coal business all his life in the anthracite coal fields. He said that practically every operator in the coal field will be compelled to shut down in the not very far distant future. He made this statement: That all private operators in the coal business have practically gotten out, or have been forced to quit because of labor wars and the 7-hour day, and the only operators that are continuing today are those that are being continued by the bankers, because of the fact that the bankers have loaned money to those coal companies and they are either compelled to operate them or lose all that they have loaned to these corporations; and they may lose all and the miners all lose their jobs.

Now, the question is serious. Are we going to give labor a fair deal, also, at the same time, are we going to give industry a fair deal, and are we going to give the American people a fair deal? That is the question the people of this country want Congress to answer, and I hope we will answer it in a short time before it is too late. And there is no time to lose. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION—THE CLASH OF IDEOLOGIES IN AMERICA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in this country of ours we have two ideologies in respect to war. Those ideologies have come to the point where they are clashing violently and where America must choose between them. If we adopt as our permanent policy one ideology, sometimes contemptuously referred to as "isolation," but which is not isolation at all, we may safely count on remaining at peace with the world. If we adopt as our policy the other ideology, the interventionist ideology, it will simply be a question of time when it will drag us into war.

I have said that isolation is a misnomer, and it is. The isolation ideology does not suggest or even intimate that America should isolate itself from the world. It merely suggests that we should isolate ourselves from the wars that are eternally brewing in the cockpit of Europe and in other foreign trouble areas of the globe. This we are fortunately able to do because of our detached geographical position.

A nation is no more to blame for isolating itself from war than an individual is for isolating himself from a fight when a fight is not necessary. When the G-men shot down the outlaw, John Dillinger, they sent a rain of lead across a public alley in Chicago. The citizens who were looking on had a perfect right to cross that alley, it being a public reservation, but being practical persons, endowed with a reasonable degree of common sense, they did not do so while the revolvers were barking and the lead was pouring. Those citizens did not isolate themselves from the world. They simply isolated themselves from that fight, and very properly and sensibly so.

The founder of the ideology which kept us out of wars for over a century of our national life and that will continue to keep us out of war for all time if we adhere to it, the misnamed isolation ideology, was George Washington.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. When was that century that we kept out of war?

Mr. LUDLOW. I mean that it has kept us out of many difficulties we would have gotten into if we had not had that philosophy. As a matter of fact, for more than a century prior to the World War our isolation policy kept us out of wars overseas. Thomas Jefferson was one of the most ardent supporters and defenders of this philosophy.

ANOTHER MADMAN IN EUROPE

When Washington and Jefferson were living, conditions in the Old World were not far different from conditions today. A madman was loose in Europe, even more ruthless than Hitler. His name was Napoleon. He will go down in history for his fiendish cruelties, for the misery he caused, for the homes he desolated, for the widows and orphans he made. Under his malevolent sway ancient boundaries crumbled and age-old dynasties crashed like houses of cards. Did Washington and Jefferson advocate American intervention to suppress Napoleon? Not at all. The bug of internationalism had never bitten them. Unlike our modern internationalists they had a very firm conviction that Europe's affairs were none of our business. Jefferson, who had been Minister to France, was very bitter toward Napoleon and wrote many letters denouncing him, referring to him as a "butcher." But Washington and Jefferson thanked God for the wide ocean lying between America and Europe and wisely insisted that America should leave Europe and its affairs severely alone. Napoleon was more brutal than Hitler, but Jefferson did not believe that we should try to wipe out the sins of Napoleon with the blood of American boys. It was the firm and settled conviction of Jefferson and all of the other founding fathers that we should keep out of the whole European mess, then and forevermore. And that, I believe, is good sense today, just as it was good sense 125 years ago.

Said Washington in his Farewell Address, delivered on September 17, 1796:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

And then, to stress how geography happily contributes to help America to maintain perpetual peace and to keep out of foreign broils, he added this striking admonition:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

JEFFERSON'S FAR-SEEING VISION

Remarkably similar to Washington's warning against foreign entanglements was the advice given by Jefferson in his third annual message to Congress when he said:

Separated by a wide ocean from the nations of Europe and from the political interests which entangle them together; with productions and wants which render our commerce and friendship useful to them and theirs to us, it cannot be the interest of any to assail us, nor ours to disturb them. We should be most unwise, indeed, were we to cast away the singular blessings of the position in which Nature has placed us, the opportunity she has endowed us with of pursuing at a distance from foreign contentions the paths of industry, peace, and happiness; of cultivating general friendship, and of bringing collisions of interests to the umpirage of reason rather than of force.

If we could think of Jefferson as being gifted with divine prescience, we might imagine he was thinking of present world conditions when he wrote:

But for us to attempt by war to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

The clash between the Washington-Jefferson ideology which holds that America's supreme destiny lies in attending to our own business, keeping out of foreign quarrels, and building up our moral and economic strength at home, and the modern internationalist ideology which teaches that it is America's duty to help to police the world and to join with certain powers against other powers for world dominion, went through a climactic period during the consideration of the neutrality legislation at the last session of Congress and the followers of Washington and Jefferson won that important round of the battle when the amendment was adopted placing a mandatory embargo on the shipment of munitions to belligerents. In every Congress of recent years I have introduced a neutrality resolution which would go further than a mere embargo on munitions and would embargo the shipment of all articles, whether munitions or not, to belligerents. True neutrality would require that all supplies be cut off, inasmuch as many articles—food, for instance—are quite as essential to fighting a war as guns, bombing planes, and ammunition, but while Congress has not looked with favor on a general embargo, a long step in upholding the Washington ideology was taken at the recent session when munitions were embargoed.

The Bloom so-called neutrality bill, now under debate in the Senate, runs counter to the general wish of our people that America should keep out of war. It is a shining example of the interventionist ideology. It is based on the theory that it is to the best interest of the United States to line up on the side of certain great powers and against certain other great powers. It would plunge America into power politics up to the hilt. No candid champion of the bill, however ardently he might favor it, ever claimed that it is a neutrality bill. Its proponents frankly admit that it is a bill in the interest of England and France, and its effect would be to make America an ally of the British Empire and France in any future war in which they choose to engage, because it would establish the United States as the arsenal and storehouse of supplies and credits for those countries that control the seas.

From the standpoint of creating a war risk, what could be worse for America? With a superlatively profitable war trade once established, the American interests that are the beneficiaries of the flow of wealth would pull with the strength of a million hawsers to bring America into the war on the side of their commercial allies to protect that trade. We can never keep out of war if we have an enormous stake in the game. Our stake must be in peace and not in war, if we are to remain safe and secure. Britain and France, commanding the seas and assisted by short-term credits, would be in a position to draw on the vast resources of America to wage their wars if the Bloom bill passes. If that bill is enacted and the embargo amendment is repealed, we may look forward to the next step, the placing of our armies at the disposal of Britain and France, for that is what it will amount to in the end anyway. I loathe the dictators for their suppression of liberty and their unconscionable crimes against humanity, and I would like to see every dictatorship on earth abolished, but God did not give America a commission to regulate the world, and if great masses of people prefer to live under a rule of totalitarian absolutism rather than under a form of government which would confer the blessings of freedom upon them and their posterity, what right have we to deny them their choice? We pity them but we cannot control that situation.

EFFORTS OF FOREIGNERS TO DICTATE OUR POLICY

I am heartsick over the attempts of foreign governments to dictate the foreign policy of the United States, and I am still more heartsick over the cooperation they are receiving from some of our American statesmen. This is true as to other foreign policies as well as neutrality. The Manchester Guardian, which many regard as England's leading newspaper, not even excepting the "Thunderer," of London, on July 29 last published the following special from New York:

London dispatches published in the American newspapers today suggest that there is some regret among British Government officials about the manner and the time of the United States' denunciation of her treaty with Japan. The point made is that it is unfortunate that Great Britain was not notified in advance. It is suggested that if Britain had possessed foreknowledge of the American plans, the

recent Anglo-Japanese agreement would have been of a different character. The best available evidence is that it would have been impossible to notify the British sooner because the American action was not planned in advance.

Here we have an intimation printed in a leading British newspaper, which ought to give it credence, that British Government officials were put out because the United States did not submit an important trade policy to be visaged by the British in London before it was promulgated in Washington! If these favored nations are able to influence our foreign policy, their next step may be to seek to influence our trade and commercial policy, as Britain seemed bent on accomplishing in this instance, presumably to make our trade and commercial relations with other nations conform to our new role as world policeman. If that happens, what becomes of our boasted independence? I verily believe that Washington and Jefferson would turn over in their graves if they could see how these foreign influences are reaching out to shape our foreign policy to their advantage and to the disadvantage of rival foreign nations. Yielding to these influences saps and weakens our national prestige and makes us in effect just one more combatant in a world of strife, subject to all of the hazard of a combatant's role. We should have just one policy and stick to it and that policy is "America for Americans." I will venture to say that the nations that are trying to use us by inducing us to line up in an alliance with them in both a military and commercial way would not think for a moment of accommodating us in a similar manner if the shoe were on the other foot.

HOW MUCH BETTER AMERICA IS, IF WE ONLY KNEW IT

I wish that every internationalist in the United States who imagines that it is our duty to abandon Washington's cherished policy of isolation and immunity to become a world policeman could take sabbatical leave for 1 year to study conditions in foreign countries. I would like for him to contrast the high wages paid to our workingmen, the highest wages paid in the world, with the pauper wages of other countries ranging as low as 2 and 3 cents an hour in one country I visited recently. I would like for him to contrast living conditions in America where so many people own their homes with the indescribable squalor and poverty seen in so many countries. I would like for him to contrast the freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religious worship, freedom of action which he enjoys in this country with the entire lack of such freedom in other countries, and then I would like to ask him if he wishes to see an international policy installed that will make us a part of these wretched foreign conditions and drag us down to their levels. If we do not watch our step one inevitable fact sooner or later will burn into our minds like a red-hot iron, and that is that all of our misguided good intentions never will reform and uplift power politics, but power politics if given the opportunity will destroy our democracy and drag us down to levels of slavery and degradation that cannot easily be imagined by those who do not realize how the other half of the world lives. If we really appreciate the inestimable blessings of freedom and equality which we enjoy under our priceless Constitution, we will shun power politics as we would a pestilence.

I have no patience with those who for a year or longer have been reiterating with parrotlike repetition that "if another European war breaks out, we cannot keep out of it." Why not? Of course, we can; and if I understand the temper of the American people we will keep out unless some ill-advised action drags us in, contrary to a very set and determined popular opinion. Holland, Denmark, and the Scandinavian countries kept out of the last war and they were right under the big guns. Should it be so very difficult for a nation to keep out that is 3,000 miles from the scene of conflict with a great ocean in between? It was symptomatic of the good judgment of those countries that at the very time the phrase, "We can't keep out of war if it comes," was being bandied recklessly about during the debate on the neutrality bill in the House, the American Minister to Denmark advised our Government that Denmark had notified the contending Euro-

pean nations that if war should come Denmark would be strictly neutral.

One thing certain is that we cannot hope to keep out of the world strife that is boiling in both hemispheres if we allow our citizens to build up a big stake in the war by furnishing ammunition and credits to one set of belligerents and denying the same to another set of belligerents. Aside from the un-Christian aspect of supplying munitions for the destruction of homes and mass killings of human beings, there is always the certainty that we will be pulled into the war to protect our stake.

Now, here are some figures that ought to forever doom such an unneutral proposal: In the 150 years the United States has been functioning as an independent sovereignty, England has been engaged in 54 wars, lasting 102 years, or 68 percent of the time. During the 150 years, France has been engaged in 53 wars, lasting 99 years, or 66 percent of the time. Is it possible that we intend to ally ourselves with these fighting nations by making America the arsenal, storehouse, and source of supplies for them in all of their future wars? And if we do so, how long do you think we will be able to keep out of war? Yet that is exactly what is proposed.

THERE IS ALWAYS WAR SOMEWHERE

I have the greatest respect for President Roosevelt. With many fine things he has done to improve our domestic conditions I am in full accord, and I have supported him wholeheartedly in those accomplishments, but I find it difficult to agree with his views so strikingly expressed in an interview he gave on July 4 last. That interview was summarized in the Washington Times-Herald as follows:

The policy of the administration is to try to prevent war in any part of the world, and that is the first policy of the administration, the President declared.

There is never a time when there are not wars in some parts of the world. Wars have been going on since the dawn of creation and the Almighty has not stopped them. Imagine officials at Washington trying to prevent war in any part of the world, and then imagine, if you can, the commitments we would have to make and the vast expenditure of blood and treasure it would be necessary to pour out in order to make such a policy effective. The Almighty created man with the traits of a fighting animal and there will always be wars. If we project ourselves into every foreign affair, we will find ourselves without friends and without influence, used by some nations, hated and despised by all, and sooner or later involved up to our necks in war.

No; it would be much better to cling to Washington's ideology of isolation, protected by our geographical position, than to try to set ourselves up as an arbiter to settle all of the wars in the world. It cannot be too strongly asserted that isolation does not mean isolation from the world but isolation from war and, contrary to Secretary Hull's announced belief, the placing of a complete embargo on exports to belligerents would not be "ruinous to our economic life."

I am sure that Secretary Hull had not given careful consideration to the statistics of exports when he made that statement. No one expects or wishes to shut off exports to all nations. All that is contemplated is a cessation of exports to belligerent nations just as long as they remain belligerents. Yet, according to the last report of the Department of Commerce on foreign trade, the total of our exports to all foreign countries in 1937, the last year for which statistics are available, was only 7.8 percent of our total production of movable goods. This covers our normal exports to all of the world; and if the ban on exports were applied only to two or even three or four belligerents, the loss in our normal foreign trade would be infinitesimal compared with the home market for our goods. I submit that the loss of this small fraction of our foreign business not only would not be ruinous to our economic life but it would be a small concession, indeed, compared with the frightful burden of debt that will be saddled on ourselves and on our children and our children's children if we become involved in another war. One month of war would cost us more than our profits on foreign trade for 20 years.

A TRUE NEUTRALITY POLICY

So I think it is quite clear that from the standpoint of our Nation as a whole it is good business as well as good morals—and certainly good policy from the standpoint of noninvolvement—to establish a complete embargo on exports to belligerent nations as long as those nations remain belligerents.

A true neutrality policy in harmony with Washington's ideology and designed to keep America a free and independent nation for all time would embrace at least these four cardinal principles:

First. At the outbreak of war between foreign powers, embargoes to be levied on all goods to belligerents.

Second. No American vessel to be used in trade of any sort with any belligerent or in any zone of danger.

Third. American citizens to be ordered to keep out of all danger zones, and if they disobey it will be at their own risk.

Fourth. No discretion to the President or to anyone else to discriminate between belligerents on a basis of moral judgments—in other words, to name the aggressor.

In a majority of cases, if not all instances, naming the aggressor would be tantamount to putting us in the war.

If I were President I would put a check on all sword-rattling Cabinet ministers and their bellicose subordinates and make them either remain silent or talk the language of peace instead of the language of war. That, I think, would be a contribution to the peace and security of America. We should not live in eternal fear of attack from some foreign power, for if we attend to our own business that is never going to happen. If Hitler hesitated so long about attacking Czechoslovakia and little Danzig, right at his doorstep, is anyone so fatuous as to imagine he is coming 3,000 miles across the ocean to attack us?

NO ONE WANTS WAR

If you put the question "Do you want war or peace?" to 100 American citizens, chosen at random, the unhesitating answer in each of the 100 instances probably will be "peace." Nor will you be the least bit surprised by the unanimity of the replies. The surprise and shock would come if some one of the hundred should unexpectedly answer "war." Americans are universally for peace. As a citizen and as a representative of citizens in the Congress of the United States, I am for peace with all my heart and soul. With all the solemnity I can command, my right hand raised to the Father of us all, I declare that unless America is attacked or invaded, unless we are forced into a defensive position to protect our very existence as a nation, I will never vote to send our precious boys into the hell of war. You can count on me for that. And you may be sure that I will not be misled by any fallacious reasoning or false propaganda into accepting as dangerous a situation that may not be dangerous at all as to our own national safety. There are defense wars and there are policy wars, and no internationalists are ever going to cajole or frighten me into believing that it is good policy, in order "to make the world safe for democracy," for us to hurl the flower of our young manhood into the slaughter pens of foreign countries in the settlement of boundary disputes, quarrels between reigning houses, and blood feuds that have been going on a thousand years, and that will be going on a thousand years after we are all dead and gone. I have too much love for our boys to throw their lives away in any such fashion as that.

BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS

Adequate preparedness is not inconsistent with the Washington ideology of an America free and independent, cultivating friendly relations with all nations and entangling alliances with none. I would appropriate every dollar needed to make our defenses as impregnable as possible, as insurance against attacks which I believe will never happen. Having done that, I would rely on the wisdom of Washington and the other founding fathers and the guidance of Him who said "Blessed are the peacemakers" to lead us safely through all of the trials and tribulations of the future.

This is not a political question. The arms embargo which some of us are seeking to retain was almost unanimously adopted by an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress and

approved by our Democratic President a few years ago. It was considered then to be the very best device to keep us out of war. Now the proposal is to abolish it before it ever has had a test. Surely no Democratic Member can be accused of a lack of party fealty if he votes to retain the embargo provision that had practically unanimous Democratic approval such a short time ago in the calm atmosphere that preceded the outbreak of war. The question now naturally arises, Why change it in the midst of a war? The answer is, To make America the arsenal and supply house of munitions and credits for one set of combatants. Is that neutrality? If that does not lead us straight to the yawning hell of war, I do not know what would.

But I repeat that this is not a political question. It is a great human question, touching the very heart of the humanities. Have we so far forgotten our Christian teachings that we are willing to furnish the instruments of mass murder of innocent women and children who have committed no offense and whose misfortune it is that they have been doomed by a cruel fate to the merciless domination of a godless dictator? Think how thrilled we will be when we read in the dispatches about the devastating work done by a squadron of bombing planes "over there," with an estimate of the number of women and children killed and maimed and the vast destruction to property, concluding with the information that "these planes came from America." Or when we read a heart-rending account of the strangulation of boys by poison gas, with the concluding information that "this gas was made in Pittsburgh." Oh, what has become of our Christianity?

If we repeal the arms embargo, we will be saying in effect to Britain and France: "Move over. We want to be your partner in this war."

A vote to repeal the embargo would be half a vote for war. I have pledged my sacred honor that I will not vote to send our boys into a bloody war overseas, and I will not cast half a vote to send them in. With me a pledge is a pledge, and I will redeem that pledge if I stand alone. [Applause.] Repealing the embargo would put us in the war immediately, in the role of a noncombatant ally of one set of fighting powers, and our role would be likely to change with kaleidoscopic suddenness at any minute to that of a combatant, as the pressures are applied, and the exigencies of the war situation develop. Furthermore, if we let down the munitions floodgates to furnish the lethal instruments of destruction on credit, instead of for cash, as proposed, it will not be long until the Allies will be running their war on American money.

A tourist returning from abroad told me that he did not see a smile in all of Europe.

Before we vote ourselves into the war let us think of the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching armies; of the pall that hangs over every household in Europe; of the fear that grips every heart as men are regimented and sent away to die. Then let us contrast that sad and gloomy and forbidding picture with the happiness and freedom which we enjoy under the American flag. I pray to God that we will not by any ill-considered action transform our land into what their land is today.

From out of the background of history Washington and Jefferson point the way in this crucial hour, admonishing us that we should keep America forever out of Europe and Europe forever out of the Western Hemisphere. If we catch the inspiration of their wisdom and follow their advice, America will be the main hope for the creation of a new and better world out of the ashes of carnage, and will endure forever as the great sanctuary and citadel of human freedom. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and any special orders, I may address this House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three

different subjects, and to include, first, a statement by the Secretary of the General Welfare Federation in my own home district; second, an editorial by the editor of the Los Angeles Evening News; and, third, a radio broadcast on Hispanic-American Culture by the Librarian of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], two letters which he has written to his constituency explaining his position on the neutrality question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted. There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DARROW (at the request of Mr. DITTER), indefinitely on account of illness.

THANKSGIVING DAY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the 2d of October I introduced a bill (H. R. 7556) to make the last Thursday in November of each year a legal holiday—Thanksgiving Day. In view of the fact that if action is not taken at this special session it will be too late for consideration before the pending Thanksgiving, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a matter that has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which committee has not considered it. It has been considered by no other committee, and therefore I feel constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects to the request.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1104. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to reform the lease for the Sellwood station of the Portland, Oreg., post office, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 7586. A bill for the relief of Franc Natko, his wife, Margaret Natko, and their infant child, Margaret Natko; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 7587. A bill for the relief of Ramon Fraguas Gonzalez, also known as Jose Gonzalez, also known as Ramon Gonzalez; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5782. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of the Reverend Francis W. Suretek and members of the Polish-American Citizens Association of Schuylkill County, Pa., requesting repeal of the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5783. Also, petition of the Sunbury Unit, Veterans' Welfare League of Northumberland County, Pa., requesting repeal of the Neutrality Act and substitution of a cash-and-carry system, keeping one great thing in mind—America shall not go to war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5784. Also, petition of the Schuylkill Classis (Schuylkill County, Pa.) Ministerium of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, requesting retention of the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act; to write back into that law all needful cash-and-carry clauses and controls; for peace, to preserve, to maintain, and to promote peace; to utilize all established constitutional, ordinary, and extraordinary prerogatives to their full capacity of American statesmanship for the furtherance of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5785. Also, petition of F. S. Vogelsang and other citizens of Pottsville, Palo Alto, Port Carbon, and Minersville, Pa., to keep the present Neutrality Act intact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5786. Also, petition of Louis F. Pounder and other citizens of Gordon, Ashland, Fountain Springs, Girardville, Locust Dale, and Ashland, Pa., requesting to have the arms-embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act retained, and to provide strict cash and carry for all other commodities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5787. Also, petition of the Reverend W. I. Shambaugh, First Evangelical Church of Milton, Pa., and other citizens, to keep America out of Europe's war by avoiding foreign entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5788. Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 134, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Port Carbon, Pa., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act, but if a change must be made it be strictly cash-and-carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5789. Also, petition of Lincoln Post, No. 73, American Legion, Shamokin, Pa., requesting strict neutrality, and opposing any action that might involve this country in any foreign war; urging that Army and Navy be built strong enough to defend the United States against invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5790. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of H. J. Gerhardtstein and 400 other citizens of Fort Wayne and New Haven, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5791. Also, resolution of the Allen County Republican Labor Club, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5792. Also, resolution of the Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce, urging the United States to maintain a fair, impartial, and lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5793. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the West Los Angeles Democratic Club, No. 1, to prevent profiteering and demanding that laws be made with adequate penalties applied and enforced to bring prices back to the normal standard and at no time shall they raise unless wages are increased at the same ratio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5794. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of Edward C. Dullea, of Dorchester, Mass., and 76 others, opposing any change in present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5795. Also, petition of M. A. Albisser, of Roxbury, Mass., and 35 others, advocating retention of present arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5796. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Charles H. Hawkins and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the neutrality law and no cash and carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5797. Also, petition of Herbert Stobb and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the neutrality law and no cash and carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5798. Also, petition of John Kain and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing any change in the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5799. Also, petition of citizenship chairman, Mountain State Farm Women's Club, Roneys Point, W. Va., urging that we oppose repealing of the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5800. By Mr. SCHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Grand Lodge (Mich.) Lodge, No. 179, Free and Accepted Masons, opposing any changes in the present neutrality law, and requesting that arms embargo be retained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5801. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Polish Falcons of America, of Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the newly established Polish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of Mercies, almighty and most tender God, who hast promised to those who seek Thee with all their heart that, as far as the east is from the west, so far wilt Thou remove their transgressions from them, and that, like as a father pitieth his own children, so is the Lord merciful to them that fear Him: We pray for the daily renewal of the spirit of true joy which the sense of Thy abiding presence alone can give, and for a steadfast heart to meet with constant cheerfulness the anxieties and trials of our life, that joy and trial alike may be sanctified to us as we yield ourselves—spirit, soul, and body—to the fulfillment of our sacred duty to our God, our Nation, and the world. Grant unto us, unworthy though we be, a clear vision of the beauty of holiness and a sure confidence in Him who is the strong Son of God, immortal love, even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 16, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahey	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Green	McNary	Stewart
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CIVIL-SERVICE SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of the Civil